

STATE OF MAINE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2001-446

July 25, 2001

RODNEY PEASE  
Appeal Of Consumer Assistance Division  
Decision #2001-10016 Regarding Verizon  
Maine

ORDER

---

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

---

**I. SUMMARY**

We uphold the June 12, 2001 decision of our Consumer Assistance Division (CAD) finding that Verizon Maine (Verizon) acted properly in contacting AT&T concerning the disconnection of a local service account of Mr. Rodney Pease.

**II. BACKGROUND**

In March 2001, Mr. Pease contacted Verizon and asked to have his service at (207) 989-6938 disconnected. Verizon provides Mr. Pease's local telephone service. Verizon disconnected the service and notified Mr. Pease's long distance carrier, AT&T, that the line had been disconnected. Mr. Pease subsequently discovered that AT&T inactivated its provision of long distance service on three of his accounts: (207) 989-6938, (207) 825-4111, and (207) 989-2852. He complained to CAD on May 9, 2001 that Verizon improperly told AT&T to discontinue all three lines.

After investigating the complaint with Verizon and AT&T, CAD found that Verizon had only informed AT&T about the disconnection of (207) 899-6938. AT&T's system is set up so that all three of Mr. Pease's accounts were billed together. Therefore, when one account is terminated, service on all accounts ends unless a new account is set up. CAD issued its decision on June 12, 2001. It found that Verizon had acted properly in notifying AT&T about the disconnection of (207) 989-6938.

On June 20, 2001, Mr. Pease appealed CAD's decision to the Commission. He states his complaint is that "VERIZON DID DISCONNECT MY LONG DISTANCE SERVICE by notifying AT&T on all three of my telephones." He does not believe that Verizon has the right to do this and "any communication between Verizon and my long distance carrier about my account is collusion and conflict of interest."

**III. DECISION**

The record shows that Verizon only informed AT&T about the disconnection of (207) 989-6938. A customer's long distance carrier, such as AT&T, must use local exchange carriers' networks to complete calls. When a customer makes a change in his local exchange service, such as a change of address or disconnecting service altogether, this information is entered into a database and then shared with the interexchange carrier through a computerized system called CARE (Customer Account Record Exchange). This system was developed to facilitate the exchange of information between such carriers. Verizon acted properly in posting to the CARE system that Mr. Pease had disconnected his service at (207) 989-698. AT&T's billing system caused all three of his AT&T services to be terminated. This was not the fault of Verizon. CAD correctly found that Verizon acted properly. Therefore, we decline to investigate this matter further and, we uphold the decision of CAD.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2001.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

---

Dennis L. Keschl  
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR:      Welch  
   Nugent  
   Diamond

## NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within 30 days of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.